

City Council Special and Regular Meetings, February 22, 2000

Twin Pines Senior and Community Center, 1223 Ralston Avenue

SPECIAL MEETING: 5:45 P.M.

CLOSED SESSIONS

A. Conference with Property Negotiator, Susan Westman, pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8

1. APN: 043-081-060

B. Conference with Legal Counsel, existing litigation, pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9

1. Helen Eakin vs. City of Belmont, Superior Court Case #409126

C. Conference with Legal Counsel, existing litigation, pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9

1. Knolls of Belmont vs. City of Belmont, Superior Court Case #409314

D. Conference with Property Negotiator, Susan Westman, pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8

1. APN's: 045-246-130, 045-243-040, 045-252-080; 772-003-000-1-00; 045-025-252-06A; 045-025-252; 17A-30-A; 045-247-040; 045-247-030; 772-003-000-100, CA; 040-311-120; 040-331-200; 045-182-080; 045-182-070; 045-243-020; 045-243-030; 045-182-100; 045-182-110; 045-182-240; 045-164-030; 040-332-230.

E. Conference with Legal Counsel, anticipated litigation,. Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9:

1. One Case

Attended by Councilmembers Warden (left 6:50 pm. return 6:53pm), Hahn (left 6:10 pm return 6:15 pm), Wright, Rianda, Cook, City Manager Westman. Parks and Recreation Director Mittelstadt and Attorney Orton attended Closed Session A. Attorney Zafarrano attended Closed Session B. Public Works Director Curtis attended Closed Session D. City Clerk Kern was excused from attending.

Adjournment at this time, being 7:05 P.M., these Closed Sessions were adjourned.

Meeting not tape recorded

Kathy Kern

Belmont City Clerk

STUDY SESSION

Discussion and consideration of Conceptual Plans for City Hall exterior remodel and addition. (Continued from 2/8/00)

City Manager Westman requested that Council chose a scheme for the exterior of City Hall, so that the architects could begin work on the detail drawings.

Councilmembers Warden, Hahn and Rianda stated they liked Scheme A, which was curvilinear.

City Manager Westman stated that the architect would insure that decorative bands around the building related to the front entrance and more glass would be added, to insure that the first floor lobby and third floor area were well lit.

Councilmember Cook stated that she did not like either rendering, but had liked the first set of asymmetrical drawings.

Councilmember Wright stated that he agreed with C. Cook.

City Manager Westman explained that the next step would be to bring back the site plan and conceptual design for Council approval.

Adjournment at this time, being 7:10 P.M., this meeting was adjourned.

Meeting not tape recorded

Kathy Kern

Belmont City Clerk

REGULAR MEETING - 7:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL

COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT: Warden, Hahn, Wright, Rianda, Cook

COUNCILMEMBERS ABSENT: None

Staff Present: City Manager Westman, Assistant to the City Manager Williams, Public Works Director Curtis, Community Development Director Vanderpriem, Finance Director Fil, Police Chief Goulart, Fire Chief Jewell, Parks and Recreation Director Mittelstadt, City Attorney Savaree, City Clerk Kern

REPORT FROM CLOSED SESSION

Mayor Cook announced that direction was given, but no action was taken.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Cook announced that Girl Scout Troop 1269 was not available, so she asked Public Works Director Curtis to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY/PRESENTATIONS

Proclamation declaring Arbor Day in the City of Belmont, March 4, 2000.

Mayor Cook presented the Arbor Day Proclamation to Branch Manager Chiochios, who explained the various activities planned for March 4th, Arbor Day at the Belmont Library.

PUBLIC/COUNCIL COMMENTS

C. Wright informed the Council that he had been appointed to the League of California Cities Administrative Services Policy Committee.

C. Rianda stated that she had been appointed to the League of California Cities Transportation Policy Committee.

C. Hahn informed the Council that Mr. Beweley with South Bayside System Authority had not taken the position in Egypt and would be staying on as General Manager.

AGENDA AMENDMENTS

Mayor Cook announced that items 5-D (Trench Cut Ord) and (item 5-C Appeal) Robin Whipple would be continued to the meeting on March 14th.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval of meeting minutes: Special and Regular Meetings of February 8, 2000.

Approval of Warrant List Dated: 1/27/00 for total amount of \$472,701.89 and dated 2/3/00 for total amount of \$164,438.96.

Written Communication 1). Rec. 2/7/00 ltr. to FCC re. KMTP, SF, CA Complaint for Carriage; 2). Before the PUC of CA Notice of Filing applic. to amend certificate of public convenience & necessity to operate as a Passenger State Corporation (USA Shuttle Service); 3). Notice of Applic. for certificate of public convenience & necessity (My Shuttle).

Motion to approve Claims Management Report.

Resolution No. 8693 approving a permanent encroachment permit for the construction of a wood deck within a public easement at 2850 Belmont Canyon Road. APN:043-072-320 (Gorgolinski)

Resolution No. 8694 Authorizing the Filing of Applications For National Highway Safety Act Program Funding with the State of California Office Of Traffic Safety for: 1) A Speed Monitoring Awareness Program in the Amount Of \$14,245, and 2) A Priority Control System for Integrated Emergency Response in the Amount of \$282,000, and Stating the Assurance of the City of Belmont to Complete the Projects.

Resolution No. 8695 authorizing payment for Change Order No. 76 for an amount not to exceed \$65,202.00 for furnishing and installing seven security cameras at the Belmont Station, Ralston/Harbor/Holly Grade Separation Project, Phase B, Kiewit Pacific Corp. City Contract No. 330-B.

Resolution No. 8696 authorizing the City Manager to enter into a contract for the Belmont Police Department, in conjunction with the San Carlos Police Department, to purchase and install mobile Data Server Software.

Motion pursuant to Section 1-11 of the Municipal Code authorizing review of Planning Commission action of February 1, 2000, Item 6-A Public Hearing –900 Sixth Avenue to consider a conditional use permit to modify the detailed development plan to alter the landscape plan, eliminate a retaining wall, and substitute an elevator tower element for the tunnel entrance on Sixth Avenue, Application No. 99-1134, APN 045-152-540-570; Zoning PD. CEQA Status: Exempt Robert Tucker, Hardison, Komatsu, Ivelich & Tucker (Applicant) Paradigm Health Care L.P. (Owner).

Motion to approve Budget Calendar.

Motion to accept State Gas Tax Audit for FY 6/30/98; Measure A Compliance Report for 6/30/99; and Prop 111 (Gann Limit- Compliance Report FY 6/30/99).

Consent Calendar adopted. Moved by C. Warden, seconded by C. Wright and approved unanimously, by show of hands.

PUBLIC/HEARINGS

Public Hearing to consider a Resolution amending the Downtown Specific Plan Architectural Design Guidelines Community Development Director Vanderpriem reviewed the recommendations of the Downtown Task Force and the Planning Commission. He noted that the Council amendment for architectural guidelines to avoid architectural themes that may be in conflict with the Victorian craftsman theme used in the downtown had been incorporated into these changes. He read the amendment which included use of cement plaster exterior to building accents only and utilizes examples of shingle, craftsman, late Victorian, Edwardian and bungalow style. This theme would be used in the Village Center block and blocks immediately abutting the North across Ralston Avenue, West across Sixth Avenue and South across Waltermire Street.

Mayor Cook opened the public hearing.

On motion by C. Warden, seconded by C. Wright and approved unanimously, to close the public hearing.

C Warden suggested that the words "shall not use" be added to the Architectural Theme Zone Guidelines and the Resolution to strengthen the language. This language would replace the words "shall avoid" ...Spanish, colonial, etc.... in the fourth sentence.

Council concurred with this modification.

Community Development Director Vanderpriem outlined the area that this design theme applied to: The Village Center; all commercial property to the West of El Camino Real; both sides of El Camino Real; East of El Camino Real; commercially zoned properties that front on Old County Road /Ralston Avenue; main corridors driving into Belmont; North to San Mateo and South to San Carlos.

Action: on motion by C.Warden, seconded by C. Rianda, and approved unanimously, by show of hands to adopt:

RESOLUTION. NO. 8697 -recommending City Council adoption of amendments to the Downtown Specific Plan and General Plan modifying architectural theme guidelines (appl. No. 98-1065) **add amendment to wording to include "shall not use"** in fourth sentence.

Hearing to consider appeal filed on February 8, 2000, by Steven Eckert, on action taken by the Planning Commission on February 1, 2000, on an application for a variance to backyard setback for a suspended deck granted for property located at 1816 Oak Knoll Drive being Lot Pt of 9, Block 9, Subdivision BCC#1 APN 044-064-090.

Community Development Director Vanderpriem reported this was an appeal to the Planning Commission decision to approve a variance to allow a deck currently existing into the rear yard setback. He said the plans showed the required 15 foot rear yard requirement, with the existing deck at 10 ft. from the property line for an encroachment of 5 ft. He explained that staff had verified the accuracy of the measurements for the set back and the deck. He recommended upholding the Planning Commission's decision to approve the variance.

In response to C. Warden, City Attorney Savaree explained that the Council should listen to the testimony presented, and then decide if the Planning Commission made the correct decision on whether or not the variance should have been granted. She said information provided tonight by the appellant and the respondent could be considered.

Mr. Eckert, 1814 Oak Knoll Drive, stated that the issue before the Council was different from the Planning Commission because the Council dealt with policy and these decisions were considered precedence. He reported that the plans submitted by the Sirenko's differed from the text of the variance request which stated that the encroachment was 5ft. Mr. Eckert said the original deck was 6 ft and the report indicated that the deck was 10 ft. He noted that the previous owner told him the deck was 15 ft. He said the application did not correctly match the current construction of the deck and the usability of the back yard. He disagreed that the back yard was unusable. Mr. Eckert said the deck had no cross bracing and he did not know how it would look when this was added.

Mr. Eckert explained that he had sent a letter to the Planning Commission and staff to indicate that the application did not match the actual building. He thought field checking would have been done before the Planning Commission meeting to check the accuracy of the application. He said the staff report identified he and his wife as the people that filed the complaint that started the code enforcement action. He said that because this was done, he felt his complaint should be weighted very strongly by staff. He said the staff report did not address his privacy at all.

Mr. Eckert said that in talking with the Planning staff, he was informed that the Planning Commission needed to make all five findings and should not be compromised to justify a decision. He said that the staff report indicated that every home had a right to "private open space" but it was not clearly defined. He said it appeared that ground level open space was not as private as space further up. He said that if the City wanted to change the way set backs for suspended decks was calculated, then the ordinance needed to be changed through the public hearing process.

Mr. Eckert said the Council needed to consider two factors: 1). Whether it encroached; and, 2). whether there was something special about the property. The two findings he would like Council to focus on were: 1). it would be an unnecessary hardship to enforce this ordinance; and, 2). that it would be a grant of special privilege. He said this was not the only small lot on the block, so that argument should not be considered in this decision. He said there was only one finding in the Resolution to overturn the variance and he would like the Council to make a ruling on each of the five findings to give clear direction to the citizens about which findings were important. Mr. Eckert stated that if this variance was upheld, he would make an application for a similar deck to be built.

C.Cook clarified that Mr. Eckert had not measured the deck himself, but relied on information provided by the previous owner.

Mr. Eckert stated that the numbers did not add up. The staff report indicated that it was a 10 ft. deck originally with a 5 ft. encroachment, which would put the house 5ft from the property line. He said he had personal knowledge that the house was 21ft. from the property line. He believed the encroachment was 9ft. not 5ft. based on the survey.

Community Development Director Vanderprien clarified that the staff report did not indicate that the existing deck was 10ft. It talked about what the maximum deck size could be in that area. The site was field checked before the staff report was written. He said the deck was 12 ft and the three ft discrepancy offset the 1ft. encroachment that Mr. Eckert was concerned about. He explained that there was no finding for private open space. He said the staff used this terminology to deal with the issue of depriving the applicant of something other people in the area already enjoyed, and that the private open space was the decks on these downhill slopes.

In response to C. Warden, Community Development Director Vanderpriem stated that he did not think there was any other rear setback along this street.

In response to C. Hahn, Community Development Director Vanderpriem explained that the deck had not been built to code and that was the reason the building permit would be required.

In response to C. Rianda, Community Development Director Vanderpriem stated that a building permit would be required whether the deck stayed, or was demolished.

Yuri Sirenko, 1816 Oak Knoll Drive, stated that he was sorry that he had not had the opportunity to have the Councilmembers visit his home to see the deck in question. Mr. Sirenko indicated that the deck was an important feature of the house which helped determine the purchase. He clarified that the deck was 12 ft, with a 5 ft. encroachment. He noted that this had been verified by a professional design group. He used a slide to show that the deck did not encroach. Another slide showed how hazardous it would be to get to the back yard through the basement door. Mr. Sirenko reported that Mr. Eckert had finished off his downstairs with two additional rooms which he rented out. He said he only has two levels of construction and showed a photo with a room that was below the garage but was not considered a third level as reported.

Mr. Sirenko said the previous owner had left the barbecue for him, which indicated to him that the deck had been used. He said they did not use the deck for frequent parties because they lived on the windy side of the mountain and it was only usable in the fall. He said the only parties that he had given had been attended by all the neighbors and most parties ended by 10:00 or 10:15 P.M.

Mr. Sirenko stated one of the main reasons they bought their home was the deck and the view from it. He said there was no other accessible place to sit outside. He said if the deck was removed it would interfere with his neighbors privacy. He said that Mr. Eckert had been permitted to add bedrooms with windows that do impact the privacy of the neighbors. He said he felt it would be discriminatory to allow one neighbor special permit to do construction and not allow them to rebuild the deck. He said the neighbors had purchased their homes with the deck in place and if it had to be removed it would change the view.

Mrs. Sirenko, 1816 Oak Knoll, said she was upset about purchasing this home because this appeal has effected their quality of life. She said they bought this home because of the deck and if it had to be removed it would effect the property value of the house and effect the neighbors privacy because they would be looking straight into the neighbors windows. She regretted that Mr. Eckert had put energy into this appeal to destroy their deck. She said Mr. Eckert had lived in his home for nine years with this deck in place. She said he was the only neighbor to complain about the deck. She said the deck does not look into his bedroom. Mrs. Serinko said that destroying the deck would not resolve any of the issues that Mr. Eckert presented. She said it would be more reasonable to deal with this issue another way. She said it was uncomfortable to live next to a person who has filed an appeal. She asked the Council to grant them the variance so their quality of life would not be destroyed.

Ms. Mason, 1917 Hillman Avenue, stated she lived on the downslope from the Sirenko's deck and had no issue with it. She said they were reasonable people and they would respond to any safety issues responsibly.

Mr. Mason, 1917 Hillman Avenue, stated he had no issues with the deck. He clarified that his deck did not extend across Mr. Sirenko's property line. He said his deck was 8ft from the property line.

He explained that the comments made by Mr. Eckert about his landscaping and yard were incorrect.

Mr. Krutz, 1919 Hillman Avenue, stated that the deck had not had an impact on his family and that the deck had been used responsible. He said there was mature landscaping that would be changed if the yard had to be reconfigured. He said he would support Mr. Eckert's application for a deck.

Mrs. Eckert, 1814 Oak Knoll, said she thought it was important to look at issues like this without being injurious to either party. She said they did not feel comfortable telling perspective buyers what things had been permitted and not permitted.

In response to C. Cook, Mrs. Eckert stated that they had called the police regarding a party at the Sirenko's because of the loudness and hour of the night

Mr. Sirenko, 1816 Oak Knoll, said the night in question that Mrs. Eckert was referring to was the first night they had moved in and they did not have anywhere else to sit.

On motion by C. Warden, seconded by C. Wright and approved unanimously, to close the public hearing.

In response to C. Warden, Community Development Director Vanderpreim said that a new request or an existing structure were treated the same.

C. Warden clarified that if the deck were to be removed it would require 5 ft to be removed which would leave a 6 ft deck.

Community Development Director Vanderpriem stated that the set back regulations for a new home deck would be 15 feet. This set back to the deck was 9-10 feet.

City Attorney Savaree explained that the Council needed to look at this issue as if the deck did not exist. The other testimony was not relevant to the issue.

C. Cook said she was having a difficult time with this issue because of the unpermitted structure.

She said the privacy issue was a stretch for her after visiting the site. She said Mr. Eckert knew about the illegal structure for many years and only recently brought it to the attention of the City, so she did not understand why he was arguing this issue now.

C. Warden said that the only thing that mattered was the findings of fact. He said he would find it hard to make the second finding which called out exceptional or extraordinary circumstances applicable to the property, etc. He said he felt that this finding of fact was not unique to this property and he thought there were implications to other properties on this street. He said he did not approve of structures that were built without permits. He said the previous owner must have known he would need a variance, and that was the reason the deck was built without permits.

In response to C. Hahn, Community Development Director Vanderpriem stated that this lot was one of the shallowest on the street and that the depth of the lot was causing the variance. He said if the deck was built today, it would be restricted to a 6-7 foot deck from the house.

C. Wright asked if any new information had been presented to change the staff recommendation.

Community Development Director Vanderpriem said that no new information had been presented to change the staff recommendation. He said there wasn't any access to the back yard. The Sirenko's were limited to deck living on this shallow lot.

C. Wright said some significant improvements would have to be made to get to the back yard. He felt comfortable with the second finding, which indicated that the steep slope conditions limited the use of the rear yard.

C. Rianda said someone should not be penalized because they had not brought this issue up sooner.

She said she would like an item on a future agenda, to reflect that when someone makes a code enforcement complaint, it should be kept confidential. She said there was a reason to adhere to rear-yard and side yard setbacks especially in an area where the homes were so close together. She said she did not think variances should be granted just because of sub-standard lots. C. Rianda said she could not make any of the findings for this variance.

C. Hahn explained that real estate disclosure laws were very strict and it was unfortunate that this unpermitted deck was not disclosed to the Sirenko's. She explained that they should have other recourse on this issue.

In response to C. Warden, Community Development Director Vanderpriem explained that the Sirenko's had the right to apply for an application for a 20% change in the deck which would constitute a different application and could be considered following the Council action.

City Attorney Savaree said that if the Council was inclined not to grant the variance it would be necessary to give staff some factual findings as to why and staff would bring back a redrafted Resolution for adoption on the next Consent Calendar agenda. She said all five findings needed to be made to grant the variance, if the findings could not be made then the variance could not be granted.

Action: on motion by C. Warden, seconded by C. Rianda, and approved on a vote of 3-2 (Cook, Wright voted no) by show of hands, to uphold the appeal and overturning the Planning Commission's decision approving a variance at 1816 Oak Knoll Drive. (Appl. No. 99-1141)

C. Warden clarified that he would like to substitute the finding that state "that there was no exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved or to the intended use of the property which do not apply generally to other properties classified in the same zoning district".

C. Cook said that she voted no because she thought there were extraordinary circumstances.

C. Rianda asked that the staff report back to Council regarding the testimony that had been entered into the record regarding a rental unit in Mr. Eckert's basement. She wondered if it was a granny unit and if additional parking had been considered.

Mr. Sirenko invited the Councilmembers to his home to discuss options for his deck.

Recess at this time, being 9:25 P.M. the Meeting was recessed.

Meeting resumed at this time being 9:30 P.M.

Call up pursuant to Municipal Code Section 1-11 regarding 900 Sixth Avenue to consider a conditional use permit to modify the detailed development plan to alter the landscape plan, eliminate a retaining wall, and substitute an elevator tower element for the tunnel entrance on Sixth Avenue, Application No. 99-1134, APN 045-152-540-570; Zoning PD. CEQA Status: Exempt Robert Tucker, Hardison, Komatsu, Ivelich & Tucker (Applicant) Paradigm Health Care L.P. (Owner).

Community Development Director Vanderpriem stated that this was a request for review of an action taken by the Planning Commission approving modifications to the design of the Belmont Vista Assisted Living project. He said the two key changes were: 1). elimination of an elevator tunnel, and substituting an elevator tower to provide access from the facility to the street level; and, 2). elimination of one of the three intermediate retaining walls. He explained that the architect would show the three and two wall scenarios for Council consideration.

He pointed out that the third wall would reduce the planting area for trees in that area. He said the Planning Commission felt that the two wall option was superior because it moved some of the mass away from the pedestrians. He said the plans showed plants cascading over the wall. He said the staff recommendation was to uphold the Planning Commission approval.

Mr. Brutting, HKIT Architects, project architect, reviewed the two schemes for the project. He explained that the contractor had done a survey to establish the building footprint on the site in relation to the walls. He said both schemes provide an exterior elevator located above the new building and linking into the existing building. He said the elevator would be located where the original tunnel was planned earlier. Mr. Brutting showed Scheme A with the third wall and the elevator and landscape plan. He explained Scheme B without the third wall which would accommodate more planting and trees from 4-8 ft. and more green between the two walls. He said they would leave two areas of the wall open to allow for cascading plants. He said that the street concrete wall would be faced in a light material to match the other wall and capped. He said they would add more railing for the elevator. Mr. Brutting said he thought the elimination of the third wall served the community and project better by providing more landscaping between the two walls.

In response to C. Hahn, Mr. Brutting stated that there was 15 feet of horizontal space between the two walls in Scheme B, and there would be 7.5 feet between the three walls in Scheme A.

Community Development Director Vanderprien said there was an approved detailed landscape plan for a three wall project. He said there were additional plantings proposed for a two-wall plan.

C. Cook asked for an explanation regarding the height difference in the two and three wall scenarios.

Community Development Director Vanderprien explained that the lowest wall was about 4 ft. and the highest point of the upper wall was 11 ft. which totaled 15 ft of vertical height. He said that if the intermediate wall was added to the project, there would be a 4ft., 5ft. and 6ft. wall in place, for a maximum of 15 ft. of vertical. He explained that the wall heights would be the same as the original plans.

Mayor Cook opened the public hearing.

Ms South, 900 Sixth Avenue Paradigm Healthcare General Partner, introduced the project team and said they would respond to any questions or concerns of Council.

Ms. Middleton, 86 Renato Ct, #12A, Redwood City, Holiday Inn Express, spoke in support of the Planning Commission decision to approve the modifications with the addition elevator tower and the elimination of the third wall.

Mr. Bauer, 1027 Tahoe Drive, asked Council to support the Planning Commission decision and the changes presented by the architects. He said he thought they would enhance the City.

Mr. Carlson, 1766 Terrace Drive, said he supported the Planning Commission decision to approve this project.

Mr. Krutz, 1919 Hillman, stated he had reviewed the plans and encouraged the Council to accept the Planning Commission's decision to add the elevator and eliminate the third wall.

On motion by C. Warden, seconded by C. Wright and approved unanimously, to close the public hearing.

Action: on motion by C. Wright, seconded by C. Warden, and approved by show of hands, 4-1 (Rianda, no)to adopt:

RESOLUTION NO. 8698 upholding the Planning Commission approval of a modification to Conditional Use Permit 99-1134 to allow changes to retaining walls and elevator access for the Belmont Vista Assisted Living Facility at 900 Sixth Avenue.

Public Hearing to consider Introduction of Trench Cut Ordinance.

Mayor Cook opened this Public Hearing and announced that it would be continued to March 14th for further discussion.

Call up pursuant to Municipal Code Section 1-11 regarding 1840 Robin Whipple Drive to Consider review of Planning Commission action of February 1, 2000, Item 6-E Public Hearing to consider design review for a second-story addition, consisting of approximately 1,169 s.f. to an existing 1,873 s.f. (including garage and covered entry porch) single-story home. Total floor area including the garage would be approximately 3,042 s.f. Maximum permitted floor area for the lot is 3,065 s.f. (Appl. No. 99-1144) APN: 044-311-150; Zoning: R1-C CEQA Status: Exempt David Hernandez (Applicant) Jen and Charlie Montgomery

Mayor Cook opened this hearing and stated that it would be continued to the Meeting of March 14th for further discussion at the request of the homeowners.

BOARD, COMMISSION, COMMITTEE UPDATES, AND STAFF REPORTS

Grade Separation Report.

Public Works Director Curtis announced that the Ralston/El Camino east intersection would be open on Monday, February 28th and the Ralston underpass would open on March 20th.

Direct Access/Ralston 101 Report.

Public Works Director Curtis stated that he now had the final evaluation for the land enhancement and the cost was \$1.2 million. He said they hoped to be in construction in yr.2001 to coordinate with the auxiliary lane construction on Highway 101.

Update on televising Council Meetings.

Assistant to the City Manager Williams reported that as soon as the Senior and Community Center was wired with fiber cable the City Council meetings could be televised. In response to Council questions, Mr. Williams reported that the meetings would not be on tape delay.

Update on Traffic Calming Task Force.

Assistant City Engineer Jones reported that the first meeting of the task force would be held on March 9th, at 7:00 P.M. at City Hall in Room 101. He said that they had between 18-24 citizens who had expressed interest in attending.

Discussion and direction regarding proposed street signs.

Council concurred on three designs and made comments which included: would like the word Avenue or Street spelled out, possibly for major streets; liked City logo on sign; did not like block numbers on same line as street

address; red color not appropriate; liked blue color on white; concern about vandalism on pop-up of City Logo on sign.

Staff stated they would work with the three top selections and return with examples for Council to consider.

MATTERS OF COUNCIL INTEREST/CLARIFICATION

Consideration and direction for a City Policy for ensuring anonymity for code violation complaints. **(Warden)**

City Attorney Savaree stated that the City did not disclose names of complainants. She said it was only necessary if a case went to court or during discovery complaints.

Council concurred to direct Staff to state the policy in writing and return for Council clarification.

Consideration and direction for a City policy for naming streets, parks, public buildings, and various **other City properties. (Warden)**

City Manager. Westman stated that the city did have a policy for naming city parks and the staff would bring this policy to Council as soon as possible to determine if changes were needed.

Consideration and direction to review the Summerhill Development proposal at the Jewish Community **Center site. (Warden)**

C. Warden stated that he thought it would be valuable to give input to Summerhill Development. Council concurred to hold study sessions for three large projects: Summerhill; Davey Glen and Immaculate Heart of Mary.

Staff to return with a written policy for review of large projects by Council.

ADJOURNMENT at this time 10:30 P.M., this meeting was adjourned in memory of Mrs.

Irene Papan, wife of State Senator Papan.

Meeting Tape Recorded

Tape No. 452

000a-5.3c

Kathy Kern

Belmont City Clerk